

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,785	07/13/2001	Laurence Sebillotte-Amaud	210374US0	1492
22850	7590 05/12/2003			
•		, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.	EXAMI	NER
1940 DUKE S ALEXANDRI			OGDEN JR, NECHOLUS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1751	16
			DATE MAIL ED: 05/12/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)
	•	09/903,785	SEBILLOTTE-ARNAUD ET AL.
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit
		Necholus Ogden	1751
Period	The MAILING DATE of this communication for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A S TH - E al - If - If - F	SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION AND STATE OF THIS COMMUNIC	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed or	0 <u>5 May 2003</u> .	
2a)[☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.	
3)[Dispos	Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice usition of Claims		
4)[extstyle ext	cation.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wit	hdrawn from consideration.	
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)[Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.		
7)[Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.	
	ation Papers —		
,-	The specification is objected to by the Exa		
10)L	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐		
4.45	Applicant may not request that any objection		
11)[The proposed drawing correction filed on _ If approved, corrected drawings are required		isapproved by the Examiner.
12\[The oath or declaration is objected to by the		
, -	•	ic Examiner.	
	y under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	vrojan priority under 35 H S C 3	\$ 119(a)-(d) or (f)
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	reigh phonty under 33 0.3.0.	3 1 19(a)-(d) 01 (i).
	a) All b) Some * c) None of:	monts have been received	
	1. Certified copies of the priority docu		polication No.
	2. Certified copies of the priority docu3. Copies of the certified copies of the		
	application from the Internation * See the attached detailed Office action for	al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
14)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for don	mestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).
15)[a)	•	
Attachm	nent(s)		
2) 🔲 N	otice of References Cited (PTO-892) otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper N	8) 5) Notice of I	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/903,785

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5-05-03 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 objected as a duplicate claim under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 11 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glenn, Jr. et al (6,277,797).

Applicant argues that Glenn, Jr. et al neither teaches nor suggests using his oxyethylenated or oxyethylenated/oxypropylenated compounds to thicken his liquid compositions.

The examiner contends and respectfully disagrees with applicant. The claimed invention is broadly claiming a composition, wherein said composition comprises three components a) surfactant; b) silica; c) an oxyalkylenated compound; and d) water. The newly amended claims describe the oxyalkylenated compounds as being a thickening agent. Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim, any composition

Application/Control Number: 09/903,785

Art Unit: 1751

comprising a-c meets the claim limitations. Therefore, Glenn, Jr. et al teach a liquid composition, however, the claims of present invention do not preclude liquid composition and therefore meet the claimed limitation.

With respect to the oxyalkylenated compound being a thickening agent. The examiner contends that applicant is allowed to be his own lexicographer. However, the component claimed by applicant is well known in the art and is cited in the four corners of the Glenn, Jr. et al reference. Therefore, the properties of the claimed would have been obvious, absent a showing to the contrary, because they would encompass similar functions and properties since they are the same component, but used for a different purpose. The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. In re Linter, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972) In re Dillon, 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied,500 U.S. 904 (1991). The rationale to modify or combine the prior art does not have to be expressly stated in the prior art; the rationale may be expressly or impliedly contained in the prior art or it may be reasoned from knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, established scientific principles, or legal precedent established by prior case law. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). See also In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Application/Control Number: 09/903,785

Art Unit: 1751

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Necholus Ogden whose telephone number is 703-308-3732. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on 703-308-4708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Necholus Ogden Primary Examiner Art Unit 1751 Page 4

no May 9, 2003